

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,996	02/05/2007	Michiel T. Kreutzer	63611A	6871
7550 06409/2010 The Dow Chemical Company P.O. BOX 1967			EXAMINER	
			HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE	
Midland, MI 4	8641		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/589,996	KREUTZER ET AL.			
Examiner initiated interview California	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SUSAN HANLEY	1651			
All Participants: Status of Application: after final					
(1) <u>SUSAN HANLEY</u> . (3)					
(2) Kevin Nilsen.	(4)				
Date of Interview: 2 June 2010	Time: <u>3:00</u>				
Type of Interview:	int's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: 103 with Shiraishi					
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed: Shiraishi					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:			
Part III.					
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.					
/Susan Hanley/ Examiner, Art Unit 1651 (A	.pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ex. Hanley informed Mr. Nilsen that although claim 1 was amended, new text was not underlined. Ex. Hanley stated that the amendment would be entered anyway and that prosecution would be reopened since Shiraishi teaches the claimed range for aspect ratio.